

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/655,964	09/06/2000	David M. Singleton	TH0681N (US)	9045
75	90 04/20/2004		EXAMINER	
Yukiko Iwata			OGDEN JR, NECHOLUS	
	any, Intellectual Property		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PO Box 2463			AKI ONI	I AI EK NOMBEK
Houston, TX 77252-2463			1751	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			4			
*	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/655,964	SINGLETON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Necholus Ogden	1751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of th riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	n.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0:	9 February 2004.					
	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allo						
Disposition of Claims		•	8			
4)  Claim(s) <u>1-10,12,70-73 and 75-102</u> is/are p 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) <u>1-10, 12, 70-73, 75-102</u> is/are rej 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objection to  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeya rrection is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(	(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in priority documents have bee reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Application/Control Number: 09/655,964

Art Unit: 1751

## Response to Amendment

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-10, 12, 70-73, 75-100 and 102 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singleton (5,780,694) is withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments.

## Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, 12, 70-73, 75-100 and 102 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 3. Claims 1-10, 12, 70-73, 75-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (US 4,075,129).

Murata teaches detergent compositions comprising an active detergent component comprising a mixture of (A) 0-70% by weight of an unbranched alkyl ether sulfate, having an average carbon atom number 8-13 [Formula (I)], and (B) at least 30% by weight of a branched alkyl ether sulfate with an average carbon atom number in the range of 8-13 [Formula (II)]. See the abstract. Therefore, the average number of carbon atoms in the hydrophobic alkyl groups of the specific component mixture range between 8 and 13, largely overlapping applicant's claimed range of about 9-14.5. Murata additionally teaches that the total detergent containing the specific component may additionally contain other conventional detergent additives such as (a) amphoteric (zwitterionic) co-surfactant, (b) nonionic co-surfactant, such as capped, partially capped

Application/Control Number: 09/655,964

Art Unit: 1751

or fully capped polyoxyalkylene ethers, (c) cationic co-surfactant (d) detergent builders, (e) heavy metal-sequestering agents, such as EDTA etc.

Murata is silent with respect to skeletal isomerization and isopropyl branching, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to comprise the biodegradable sulfate as claimed because Murata teaches a similar branched compound that encompasses the similar properties of the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is held that a prima facie case of obviousness may be made when chemical compounds have very close structural similarities and similar utilities. "An obviousness rejection based on similarity in chemical structure and function entails the motivation of one skilled in the art to make a claimed compound, in the expectation that compounds similar in structure will have similar properties." In re Payne, 606 F.2d 303, 313, 203 USPQ 245, 254 (CCPA 1979). See In re Papesch, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and In re Dillon, 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed. Cir. 1991)

Compounds, which are, position isomers (compounds having the same radicals in physically different positions on the same nucleus) or homologs (compounds differing regularly by the successive addition of the same chemical group, e.g., by -CH2- groups) are generally of sufficiently close structural similarity that there is a presumed expectation that such compounds possess similar properties. In re Wilder, 563 F.2d 457, 195 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1977). See also In re May, 574 F.2d 1082, 197 USPQ 601 (CCPA 1978) (stereoisomers prima facie obvious). Isomers having the same empirical formula but different structures are not necessarily considered equivalent by chemists skilled in the art and therefore are not necessarily suggestive of each other. Ex parte

Application/Control Number: 09/655,964

**Art Unit: 1751** 

7----

Mowry, 91 USPQ 219 (Bd. App. 1950) Similarly, homologs that are far removed from adjacent homologs may not be expected to have similar properties. In re Mills, 281 F.2d 218, 126 USPQ 513 (CCPA 1960).

#### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Necholus Ogden whose telephone number is 571-272-1322. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T and Th-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Necholus Ogden Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751

No 4-16-04